

This matter comes before the Court on *pro se* petitioner's "Motion for the Court to Take 'Judicial Notice of Adjudicative Facts' Pursuant to Rules of Evidence Rule 201(b)" (Dkt. #28). Although petitioner's motion is not a model of clarity, the Court construes the motion as a motion to reconsider the Court's order of dismissal (Dkt. #17) because petitioner requests that the "court should post haste reverse and dismiss the petitioner's ill-gotten conviction based on the record before this court." See Motion at 2. Motions for reconsideration are disfavored in this district and will be granted only upon a "showing of manifest error in the prior ruling" or "new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to [the Court's] attention earlier with reasonable diligence." Local Civil Rule 7(h)(1). Petitioner has failed to identify any manifest error in the Court's prior ruling or to produce new facts or legal authority that would change the Court's original analysis. Accordingly, petitioner's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. #28) is denied.

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

DATED this 25th day of February, 2008.

MMS Casuik
Robert S. Lasnik
United States District Judge